

'Speeches that draw tears': theatricality, commemoration and social history

Sophie Nield

Social History Vol. 39, no. 4, November 2014, pp. 547-556. Routledge.

On 31 August 2011, at sunset, in the heart of the English countryside, a flag was lowered over a small Wiltshire town. As the tenor bell of the Church of St Bartholomew tolled, two thousand people stood silently, and rows of current and retired service personnel drew themselves up in smart salute. The president of the local Royal British Legion branch, Maurice Baker, recited Laurence Binyon's famous words from 1914: 'They shall grow not old, as we that are left grow old; Age shall not weary them, nor the years condemn. At the going down of the sun and in the morning we will remember them'. The Union flag, carefully folded, was carried into the church, where it was placed on the altar to spend its final night in Wootton Bassett. For this ceremony took place in the town which had been since 2007, through accident and circumstance, the place through which the bodies of British servicemen and women, killed in conflict overseas, were repatriated.

The ceremony described here did not commemorate a repatriation. It was a commemoration for the ceremonies themselves, as repatriation flights had been routed back through a different airfield, and another town was now to take responsibility for marking these melancholy occasions¹. But it shared many elements of the ceremonial structure which had evolved over the preceding months and years. The observances did not have any central co-ordinating body. They began when, in 2007, RAF Lyneham became the temporary site for the arrival of repatriation flights in the UK. By chance, the then Mayor, Percy Miles, was shopping in the town when he ran into a colleague from the Council, who mentioned that a cortege would be passing directly through the town on its way to the hospital in Oxford. He put on his mayoral robes, and stood to attention as

¹ 'David Cameron thanks Wootton Bassett' *The Telegraph* 31 August 2011.

the funeral car passed through the town². Gradually, others became involved: the local branch of the Royal British Legion; local pub owners and businesspeople, and of course the people of the town. By 2009, at the height of the repatriations, the streets were thronged with people. Serving and former soldiers lined the route, lowering brightly-coloured standards as the procession went past. Bereaved families were greeted by members of the RBL Motorcycle Riders Branch, and taken to the Cross Keys pub for tea and sandwiches while they waited for the ceremony to start. The town resisted the attention of the press, and stated clearly that they wanted no politicians to come down for photo-opportunities. Overall, three hundred and forty-five servicemen and women were repatriated through Wootton Bassett in one hundred and sixty-seven separate events. The bell-ringers sounded a solemn knell as each of these took place. They were never asked to do this. 'It seemed appropriate' one told the *Daily Mirror* in 2009.

In 2014, the politics and form of public ceremonies of commemoration are very much a subject of public interest. For this year marks the 100th anniversary of the outbreak of the First World War, and the start of what has been called a 'steady drumbeat'³ of commemorative events which will take place in the UK between now and the autumn of 2018. There are to be art projects, community projects, schools and education projects. Thousands of bright red ceramic poppies currently spill from the walls of the Tower of London; municipal war memorials are being cleaned and restored. Two children from each state-funded school will visit the battlefields of the Western Front, reporting their experiences back to their schoolmates. Careful and measured attention has been paid to the tone of these events: speaking in the House of Lords debate on the programme of commemoration, Richard Faulkner, Baron Faulkner of Worcester, observed, 'It would be so easy to get this wrong, but I do not think that we have'.

² 'The town that weeps' *The Guardian* 25 February 2010.

³ House of Lords: First World War debate, 25 June 2014, accessed 15/9/14 at: <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld201415/ldhansard/text/140625-0001.htm>

I would like to offer, in this short essay, some thoughts on the use of the theatre as a descriptive metaphor in the analysis of commemorative events; in particular, those which do not present themselves as, or understand themselves to be, 'theatre' (in the sense of being rehearsed performances of fiction in front of audiences), but which nevertheless find, for many writers and historians, resonances with aspects of theatrical production. The dignified and sober obsequies performed in Wootton (now Royal Wootton) Bassett drew on tropes of military ceremony, formality and tradition, speaking of nation, sacrifice and loss. But where did the sense of 'appropriateness', about which the bell-ringers of St Bartholomew's spoke, come from? And how many participants would have been happy to have their actions described as 'theatre'? Might the theatrical metaphor, as it currently stands, be limiting our ability to interpret the material, and effective, political work of the public, 'theatrical' event?

These thoughts position themselves deliberately at the intersection of the disciplines of social history, and theatre and performance studies. Both have, over recent decades, paid considerable critical attention to ritual and ceremonial events in public space; both have, in different ways, explored the usefulness, and limitations, of the theatrical metaphor. I will address briefly some examples of this analysis in both fields, before proposing a further inflection of the idea of the 'theatrical', which should open up some space for the shared commemorative event.

The historian Paul Fussell, in his magisterial treatment of war commemoration, *The Great War and Modern Memory*, notes Ezra Pound's approval of the term 'theatre' in treatments of war⁴, before running through the various iterations and invocations of the theatrical, from the literal imitations of war experience such as the practice trenches dug in Kensington Gardens, to the ways in which many memoirists (Edward Blunden, Siegfried Sassoon, George Adam⁵) describe the events of their lives in dramatic or theatrical terms. There is much, and will no doubt be much more, to be said

⁴ Fussell, P. *The Great War and Modern Memory* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975, p. 207

⁵ Blunden, E. *Undertones of War* Oxford: Oxford University Press 1928/ 1956; Sassoon, S. *Memoirs of an Infantry Officer* London: Simon 1930; George Adam *Behind the Scenes at the Front* 1915

about how the theatre itself remembers the War, and exploits parallels between, for example, stage-fright, and 'going over the top' to reinforce the sense of unreality which pervades so many of its manifestations: the pier-end Pierrot troupe of Theatre Workshop's 1963 *Oh, What A Lovely War*; the revenants of Hans Chlumberg's 1933 *Miracle at Verdun*; the Welsh regiment rising from the earth in the National Theatre of Wales' 2014 *Mametz*⁶. But terms drawn from theatre practice are prevalent, too, in descriptions of stage-managed events in public space, and are usually deployed to indicate some kind of rhetorical emptiness; that 'theatrical' events are deceitful, hollow and manipulative at worst, and, at best, are simply being stage-managed to communicate an easily legible message. The metaphor is rooted in the apparent sharing of vocabularies with the theatre itself, including elements such as props, scenery, pre-rehearsed elements of narrative or script. It is interesting to note that the theatre is the model often used to communicate inauthenticity, artificiality and the flatness of space; the 'backdrop' of the theatrical facade serving as metaphor for the illusion of space-as-container, and the spectacular surface of what is being presented there.

An example might be David Cannadine's pioneering work on the invention of tradition, and, perhaps of even more pertinence here, his 1995 study of Lord Curzon's contribution to the management of public spectacle, and to First World War commemoration particularly. Writing initially on Curzon's stage-management of some of the greatest public ceremonies of late Victorian and early Edwardian England, such as the extraordinary Delhi Coronation Durbar of 1903, Cannadine is drawn again and again to vocabularies of spectacle. Curzon is described as both 'impresario' and 'master-of-ceremonies', whose 'visual advocacy' of the power of the British imperial state in the form of processions and large-scale events carried a 'message' to 'impress its audience'⁷. Of course, this account of spectacular imagery, designed to awe and impress a passive, watching

⁶ Theatre Workshop *Oh, What a Lovely War* London: Methuen 1967; Chlumberg, Hans 'Miracle at Verdun' trans. Edward Crankshaw, in *Famous Plays of 1932-3* London: Victor Gollancz 1933, pp. 115 - 230; 'All Quiet on the Welsh front: reliving the horrors of Mametz' *The Guardian*, 23 June 2014.

⁷Cannadine, D. 'Lord Curzon as Ceremonial Impresario', in *Aspects of Aristocracy: Grandeur and Decline in Modern Britain* London: Penguin 1995, pp. 77 - 108.

audience, fits very neatly with the image of flat and depthless stage space, on which visions appear before the wondering eyes of mortals. More broadly, as Lakoff and Johnson have noted, 'we conceptualise our visual field as a container and conceptualise what we see as being inside it'⁸. Martin Jay recalls Descartes' stated wish to be 'a spectator rather than an actor', reducing the visual world to a visual field, and consigning the body to objecthood within it⁹. It is evident that analysis of the world-as-artifice leaves writers searching for an appropriate metaphor and landing on the image of stage space, and, since the stage is (supposedly) a flat container for action, through this analogy, the world can be reduced to a visual field which is spectated but not interacted with. However, by allowing theatre to become the very by-word for the 'not-real' - the mimetic, or imitative - the model of theatre space itself is potentially being made something of a stool-pigeon for political impotence.

Certainly, there are parallels between theatre and spectacle: events such as rallies, demonstrations and military parades are concerned with concepts and ideas not otherwise materially present; they are organised around the symbolic production of meaning; they are 'stage-managed' in order to be read. This interpretation, however, seems to rely on the sense of a symbolic realm, representing a world of actual power relations which exists somewhere else. Of course, this is precisely one of the intentions of the ceremonial event - to *appear* to be separate. Their designers mobilise very specific and heightened vocabularies, and distinguish participants through various means from the run of everyday experience.

There are two issues which arise here. Firstly, I would argue that both symbolic and non-symbolic practices, manifest in space and productive of experience, are equally real and affective.

The symbolic - the 'theatrical' - has its own materiality. While *representing*, it occupies space; is

⁸ Lakoff, G. and M. Johnson *Metaphors We Live By* Chicago: University of Chicago Press 1980, p. 31.

⁹ Jay, M. *Downcast Eyes: the denigration of vision in twentieth-century French thought* Berkeley: University of California Press 1994, p. 81, n. 89

present. It constitutes, by this presence, and by its visual organisation and rhetorical strategies, a form of space which, by being contiguous with other lived and conceptual spaces, permits or obstructs other forms of social practice, particularly political ones. Not least, it operates as a producer of affect and identification in the people who watch. To reduce it discursively to a legible 'message', pitched over the foot-lights to spectators waiting in the dark, is to allow it to perpetrate its own myth of itself - 'mere' spectacle, display, and imitation; not a real politics at all. To move beyond the theatre-as-metaphor - a version of the *theatrum mundi* in which theatrical events reflect back to the world an image of itself, or alternatively in which human behaviour is likened to the artificial experience of the stage - might be perhaps to begin to retrieve the term from its position as a marker of pretence, falsehood and fakery.

The second consideration, and of most interest to me here, is what happens to the theatre metaphor when it is not a spectacular 'message' which is required, but the development of a ceremonial vocabulary, able (as for example in Wootton Bassett) to find resonance between personal grief, public memory, and national commemoration. That the performative tropes of flag, standard, bell and salute may well be borrowed, inherited or imported from ceremonial dramaturgies does not necessarily make them the sole province of their originating contexts. They become mechanisms through which people arrange to feel the things which they wish to feel, and within which they become able to express private sentiment through public symbolism. As Diderot observed in his famous *Paradox of Acting*, 'people come not to see tears, but to hear speeches that draw tears'¹⁰. Negotiated ceremonies such as these, in order to function, must not be forms of 'speaking to', but of 'speaking for', in that the spectators must feel themselves expressed and not manipulated. Cannadine, writing of Curzon's involvement with commemoration in the wake of the First World War, notes that he was operating with 'no precedents'. He had to 'try and devise rituals which would give effective expression to the contradictory feelings of triumph and tragedy which so

¹⁰ Diderot, D. *The Paradox of Acting* New York: Hill and Wang 1957, p. 68

haunted the nation and the people'. Curzon was responsible for two of the most resonant and popular commemorations which took place soon after the First World War: the interment of the Unknown Warrior in Westminster Abbey, and the permanent installation of the Cenotaph on Whitehall. His greatest triumph, notes Cannadine, was to have managed a pageant which 'most people did not know he had organised'¹¹. It was still a dramaturgy, and hence still 'theatrical', but not simply a spectacle. It was immersive and participatory: not received pronunciation, but ventriloquised speech.

This important sense of negotiation is of course not limited to commemorative, or popular, ceremonial events: Charles Tilly describes the repertoires of claim-making key to the practices of resistant politics as 'theatrical', noting, 'the theatrical metaphor calls attention to the clustered, learned, yet improvisational character of people's interaction as they make and receive each other's claims'¹². Yet there is still a need, I think, to expand our use of the term 'theatrical' to fully make space for this work, and it may be useful here for me to sketch in some of the ways in which theatricality and performance have evolved as critical terms within my own discipline. While attention is certainly paid to events which take place outside conventional theatre spaces, including ceremonies, protests and commemorations, there are nevertheless significant distinctions made within the vocabularies used to interpret them, especially since the rise of what has come to be termed Performance Studies. As Henry Bial and Scott Magelssen point out, 'a significant number of scholars chose... to pursue their research under the broader heading of 'performance'... Over time, performance studies diverged from theater history to the point where the two disciplines often seem to be rivals wielding competing assumptions, terms and methods'¹³.

¹¹ Cannadine, op cit, p. 107

¹² Tilly, C. *Regimes and Repertoires* Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2006, p. 35.

¹³ Bial, H. and S. Magelssen (eds.) *Theater Historiography: Critical Interventions* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2010, p. 2

Janelle Reinelt sketches the rise of 'performance' as an arena of investigation distinct from conventionally understood theatre studies¹⁴. Firstly, it became the term used to differentiate process from product, in the sense that performance can be seen to stage the subject in process. Secondly, while 'performance' as a field of enquiry expanded strategically to include such cultural forms as ritual, festivals, and other aspects of everyday life, 'theatre', by extension, was reduced to the study of mimetic practices in theatre buildings. Joseph Roach, too, observes that, 'derived from the Greek word for seeing and sight, theatre, like theory, is a limiting term for a certain kind of spectatorial participation in a certain kind of event... Performance... embraces a much wider range of human behaviours. Such behaviours might include what Michel de Certeau calls 'the practice of everyday life' in which the role of the spectator expands into that of participant¹⁵'. Thirdly, and crucially here for the ways it has found resonance in other scholarly disciplines, Reinelt outlines the ways in which 'performance' drew on Judith Butler's model of the performative act¹⁶), and J. L. Austin's material on performative speech¹⁷, to become the sphere which *enacts* - performance understood as iterative, transformative behaviour, a discursive practice that enacts or produces that which it names. It is a *doing*. Theatricality, by contrast, was reduced to dissimulation - a *showing*. It represents. It is the place in which things must be seen to be done.

¹⁴ Reinelt, J. 'The Politics of Discourse: Performativity meets Theatricality' *SubStance* vol. 31, no. 2/3 Issue 98/99: Special Issue: Theatricality, 2002, pp. 201-215.

¹⁵ Roach, J. (1985) *The Player's Passion* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1985 p. 46 cited in Davis, T. and Tom Postlewait (2003) *Theatricality* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2003 p. 31.

¹⁶ Butler, J. 'Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory' *Theatre Journal* 1988, 40: 519-31.

¹⁷ Austin, J. L. *How To Do Things With Words* Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press 1962/1975

Needless to say, there has in recent years been a rethinking of the question of the 'theatrical', led by some of the same scholars, and the limited positioning of theatricality which seemed to have taken hold is already in process of being disrupted. As Reinelt points out, European theatre scholarship never assigned the theatrical to the mimetic in quite the way that US scholarship did. And Davis and Postlewait explore the ways in which the term has expanded, much as 'performativity' did, to cover 'an extraordinary range of meanings, making it everything from an act to an attitude, a style to a semiotic system, a medium to a message... to some people it is that which is quintessentially the theatre, while to others it is the theatre subsumed into the whole world'¹⁸.

Yet nevertheless, even within this reformulation of theatricality, there remains something of a common thread, which is, ultimately, to do with the spatial relations of audience and actor. Marvin Carlson speaks of the 'operation of appearing as a spectacle before spectators'¹⁹. Josette Feral argues that 'theatricality seems to stem from the spectators awareness of a theatrical intention addressed to them', through 'a *process* that has to do with a 'gaze' that postulates and creates a distinct, virtual space belonging to the other', born of two conditions – 'the performer's reallocation of the quotidian space that he occupies, second through a spectator's gaze framing a quotidian space that he does not occupy'²⁰. As Davis tracks, the term 'theatricality' itself was initially coined by Thomas Carlyle in 1837, in his treatise on the French Revolution, and has become a means of addressing and investigating many cultural practices, and of opening up new ways of speaking about theatre itself. Particularly, it offers a mode in which spectators can understand their involvement as

¹⁸ Davis and Postlewait, op cit, p. 1

¹⁹ Carlson, M. 'The Resistance to Theatricality' *SubStance* vol. 31, no. 2/3 Issue 98/99 2002: Special Issue: Theatricality, pp. 238-250, p. 241.

²⁰ Feral, J. and R. P. Bermingham 'The Specificity of Theatrical Language' *SubStance* vol. 31, no. 2/3 Issue 98/99 2002: Special Issue: Theatricality, pp. 94 – 108, p. 96

enacting a kind of *'de-doublement'* – their own acting – allowing a relation to spectacle that may not be commensurate with their own sense of themselves'²¹.

The kind of events I am most interested in - protest, popular commemoration, public mourning, improvised public responses - would seem not to be, under these terms, 'performance', in the sense of being iterative, transformative behaviour, although they are all very much of the world and not the stage. Nor are they, however, forms of the 'theatrical' which position their spectators in a discrete spatial relationship to themselves. The nuance, negotiation, gestured approval and tacit investment in, for example, commemorative practices suggest a need for a differently inflected reading of theatricality. This would be still a 'place of seeing', but not necessarily one determined by the spatial relations produced by a proscenium, however loosely imagined - whether an architectural feature in a theatre building, a barrier across which one watches a Coronation parade, or a line of police corralling 'unruly' demonstrators.

We can rethink Davis' model of *'de-doublement'* as a way of uncoupling presence and representation, and a means of exploring the function of material practices that operate explicitly theatrically, rather than performatively. There would seem to be moments in which objects, people and things are not performing iteratively, but rather through a sort of 'doubling' of themselves, as they appear both as themselves and as what they represent. They imitate, or pretend to be, the things that they already are, articulated through the deployment of symbolic language - otherwise they will simply not be visible. One could think here of a judge, who is of course a judge all the time, but nevertheless will 'appear' in his or her formal role in costume, and according to routine or ritual tropes of behaviour within time-limited requirements. The point becomes to look less at what is being referred to, in terms of message, but to examine *how* reference is being made: what is the quality, shape, texture, hidden intent, or form of the representation itself?

²¹ Davis, T. 'Theatricality and Civil Society', in Davis and Postlewait (eds) op cit, p. 148

I want to propose that, rather than a space in which observer and observed are neatly bifurcated and separated by a distance across which the gaze must travel, a 'theatrical' space could be one in which the gaze (or its possibility) is *embedded*; in which visibility is at work; in which things are *available to be seen* – and which is conditioned by the awareness of that possibility. There are models here in theory: Foucault's now familiar description of the disciplinary panopticon is of course a forceful one²². This was his account of the Benthamite prison, in which each cell, open to a central well and also to the outside, created an image silhouette of the prisoner, perpetually available to the gaze of the guard in the central tower. In Foucault's account, the effect of the surveillance is such that eventually it is not necessary that the guard, or the seeing eye, be literally there to observe: the effect of observation will regulate behaviour in exactly the same way. In other words, the space has become saturated with a kind of surveillant visibility in and of itself, in which the inmates experience themselves as potentially subject to the conditions of being seen.

It is this potentiality, perhaps, rather than the condition of actually being seen, which creates spaces as theatrical. Rather than simply noting the distance between one group going by on horses and another which is standing on the sidelines, it may be possible to observe the relationship *between* the two in space, and to approach, not just their *image*, but their *experience* of being in that space. In this way, although a focus on looking may well form part of what can designate a space as a 'theatrical' space, this, I would argue, is one of its *acts*. It does not describe how it *works*. The power of abstraction is that we internalise the eye – it becomes part of the way in which we are alienated from ourselves; encounter ourselves as image, figure, representation. Abstraction becomes a process of imagining the self from the outside – placing oneself in space in the abstract – not here, but there: on a map, in a country, in a public square or other situation.

²² Foucault, M. (1980) 'On Geography' in *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977* Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, pp. 63-77.

In this way, I think, it becomes possible to imagine a space saturated with visuality, in which the condition of being spectated is embedded. Martin Jay situates the shift historically, noting that 'with the humanist turn of the Renaissance, an important shift occurred...For perspective meant ... (not only the vanishing point) but also the reverse pyramid, whose apex (or the infinitesimal point that came to replace it in theoretical terms)... The significance of this innovation was that the mediaeval assumption of multiple vantage points was replaced by one sovereign eye²³. But just who exactly is spectating remains an open question: the spectator, the self, the participant, the King, God, the ruin-gazer, the camera, the future. The theatrical may not be simply the mirror of the thing, but the thing itself; theatricality may not be a simple metaphor, but a material set of practices. Through the lens of a system of spaces, theatrical events are not merely identifiable because they 'represent', or because they appear to be 'like theatre'. They are determined by their production of a 'theatrical space', the characteristics and limits of which it is possible to identify, and the effects of which it is possible to articulate. The spectator may well be an invention of the space.

Within my larger project, this approach has opened up to critique moments in which people undertake theatrical behaviour without necessarily knowing (or claiming) that they are doing so; in which they make selections about 'appropriate' behaviour from what are learned vocabularies, but which they nevertheless feel to be authentically their own. Elizabeth Burns, in her extended discussion of theatricality, details the experience of a juror in a trial, who 'could not believe it was really herself sitting there in the court'²⁴. This is a person, not playing to a gallery, but immersed in a doubled representational behaviour.

The sense of detachment and the feeling of being externally 'framed' or 'directed' is one which many of us will recognise. For, while theatrical acts and spaces are shaped by human agency,

²³ Jay, op cit, p. 54

²⁴ Burns, E. *Theatricality* London: Longman 1972, p. 12-13.

not all their effects are conscious. Theatrical space, once 'produced', can coerce through its existence. It can produce effects through 'being', rather than through 'doing'. This becomes, then, a question of what we might term 'instinctive' theatricality, 'which the participants may feel to be spontaneous, but is nevertheless born of inherited dramaturgical imaginaries. As with the self-generated ceremonies in Wootton Bassett, this begins to appear as a sense of form which feels itself to be 'appropriate'. The nuance and negotiation are inflected by the mode of experience produced by theatrical space.

I wonder also if there might be a further question, allowing access to a broader aspect of social and cultural experience: those moments in which we suddenly feel ourselves to be performers, caught in the rigours of a rhetorical structure that exists outside ourselves, and yet which no outside force appears to be dictating. We feel ourselves implicated – cast – in events determined elsewhere, or prior to our involvement in them; moments in which we are present as ourselves but also potentially legible to others. Our gestures are not simply to be cast across a space towards someone else – a spectator who is able to then determine the 'theatricality' of the moment. This is a space in which our gestures do their work, whether witnessed or not, communicating not just their immediate meaning, but broader summarisations of ideas such as honour, nation, ideology, political will. The idea of theatrical space is able, potentially, to figure a different *de-doublement*, in which form and content become uncoupled, and in which presence and symbolic meaning are seen to be acting in parallel but not always in concord. Rather than spectatorship, and a spatial dispersal into watchers and actors, this re-inflected theatricality pivots around textures of presence, participation, rhetoric and representation.

To amplify this, I will return very briefly to Paul Fussell's treatment of theatrical commemoration. His chapter, 'Theater of War' opens, not with a formal theatrical show, or even a theatre-like event of the kind I have been discussing above. Rather, he writes of the strange dissociation experienced by a number of writers reflecting upon the experience of combat. 'Just

before the attack on Loos', records Fussell, 'Major Pilditch testifies to "a queer feeling these last few days, intensified last night. A sort of feeling of unreality, as if I were acting on a stage..."²⁵. Charles Carrington, in his memoir 'A Subaltern's War' also describes this condition of being 'beside oneself'. Describing the moments before an attack in which plans are being checked and rechecked, he comments, 'One half of me was convinced all this was real; the other knew it was illusion'²⁶. For Fussell, this division of the psyche into 'something like an actor, on the one hand, and spectator, on the other' is a means of survival. The theatrical element is still, to an extent, being deployed as a byword for the artificial and the absurd: as Fussell notes, 'the whole thing is too grossly farcical, perverse, cruel and absurd to be credited as a form of "real life"'. Seeing warfare as theater provides a psychic escape for the participant: with a sufficient sense of theater, he can perform his duties without implicating his "real" self²⁷. Yet nevertheless, he has clearly captured something of a theatricalised dislocation expressed through the doubling of the self; the awareness of the self somehow spectated, even if only by its own self.

I hope to have offered, in this short essay, a way of opening up questions of theatrical behaviour and theatrical doubling: a dissociation which potentially enables us to move beyond the singular application of the theatrical metaphor as the artificial and the fake, and instead offer an insight into, not only the complex negotiations around the 'appropriateness' of commemorative forms, but also aspects of our own quotidian experience. Theatrical spaces (along with most kinds of lived space) do not just produce meanings: they produce behaviours. Part of the exertion of power (authority or custom and convention) on space is the permission and restriction of actions that may take place in them. This can be regulated literally, in terms of published rules: 'do not walk on the grass', 'no running in the corridors', 'no entry'. Yet 'the impression of intelligibility' writes Henri

²⁵ Major Pilditch, IWM, cited in Fussell op cit. p. 208

²⁶ Carrington, C. *A Subaltern's War*, London: Icon 1964, cited in Fussell op cit. p. 208.

²⁷ Fussell op cit, p. 208

Lefebvre, 'conceals far more than it reveals ... Nothing can be taken for granted in space, because what are involved are real or possible acts'²⁸. A person might lower their voice in an empty cathedral. To re-address the application, and the potential range of meanings, in the theatrical metaphor, may be to refigure the theatrical itself - not as a mirror to, or imitation of the real, but as a critical lens through which we might perceive a little more of how, and why, we act.

²⁸ Lefebvre, H. *The Production of Space* trans. Donald Nicholson Smith Oxford and Cambridge MA: Blackwell. 1991, p. 143